

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	_		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
	•	09/966,754	EITAN, BOAZ
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit
	•	Chandra Chaudhari	2813
	- The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
THE N - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION isions of lime may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri- re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat- eply received by the Office later than three months after the maid d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a eply within the statutory minimum of this od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI tute. cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on _	<u> </u>	
2a) ☐	7	This action is non-final.	
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice und on of Claims	owance except for formal ma er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C	atters, prosecution as to the merits is D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
	Claim(s) 1.4 and 5 is/are pending in the ap	plication.	
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd		
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
· -	Claim(s) 1.4 and 5 is/are rejected.		
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.	
	on Papers		
9)	The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)∏ ac	ccepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to		
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)□ approved b)□	disapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in		
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.	
	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13)□	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority docum		
	2. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received in	Application No
* .	<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>		
1	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome		
8	n)  The translation of the foreign language	provisional application has	been received.
1	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dom	estic priority under 35 0.5.0	2. 33 120 dilator 121.
2) Notice	ot <b>(s)</b> the of References Cited (PTO-892) the of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(	5) Notice of	v Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)



Application/Control Number: 09/966,754

Art Unit: 2813

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ormum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 4-5 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,297,096. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because "oxidizing a top oxide layer", and "oxidizing a portion of the top oxide layer" appear to be obvious.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 09/966,754

Art Unit: 2813

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hayabuchi – US 5,324,675.

Hayabuchi (Figs. 1-4 and text in col. 3, line 51 to col. 5, line 26) discloses the claimed invention to improve memory characteristics by fabricating an ONO layer in a memory cell having a bottom oxide, depositing a nitride layer where the thickness is controlled as shown at col. 3, lines 61-65, and oxidizing the nitride layer which inherently introduces oxygen into the nitride layer (note applicant's specification on page 8, lines 5-6).

Claims 1, 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang – US 5,836,772.

Chang (Figs. 1-3 and text in col. 4, line 16 to col. 6, line 21) discloses the claimed invention to improve charge retention by fabricating an ONO layer in a memory cell having a bottom oxide, depositing a nitride layer where the thickness is controlled as shown at col. 4, lines 54-67, and introducing oxygen into the nitride layer as shown at col. 5, lines 11-20.



Application Control Number: 09/966,754

Art Unit: 2813

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandra Chaudhari whose telephone number is 703-308-1095. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon Tue Thur Fri (8:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Olik Chaudhuri can be reached on 703-306-2794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Chandra Chaudhari Primary Examiner Art Unit 2813 Page 4

Chandra Chaudhari

C. Chardhari

February 22, 2002